# Memorandum • United States Government

. Chief, Operations School

DATE: 28 October 1957

FROM : Acting Chief Instructor,

Clandestine Services Review

SUBJECT: Course Report for Clandestine

Services Review Number 18

DOG 12 REV DATE 1-4-80 BY 029725 ORIG COMP 11 OPI 11 TYPE 02 ORIG CLASS S PAGES 29 REV CLASS \_\_ JUST 22 NEXT REV 2010 AUTH: HR 10-2

#### SUMMARY.

In the two weeks from 30 September through 4 October 1957, seventy speakers came before 46 students in a series of 59 presentations. Like other groups of students who have gone through this exercise, this group considered the course of great value. Also, as in the past, the students appreciated the opportunity to get an overall view of the Clandestine Services and its support mechanisms, and especially the opportunity to hear the views of key men in the organization. Platform personality and good speech-making provided individual highlights -in this instance, Mr. Kirkpatrick, Mr. Baird.

25X1A9a 25X1A9a

25X1A9a spell-binding

25X1A9a

w\_dry, poker -raced These seven top-ranking speakers (3.9 to 3.6 of a possible rating of 4) discussed topics as varied in depth and in professional significance as their responsibilities are disparate in scope. The one clear common denominator is: all these speakers hold their audiences.

The students were privileged to hear -- and to ask questions, as time allowed. They had some reading to do: chiefly the regulations governing the entities described in the presentations. They had no other responsibility, except that of a criticism of the course to be used as an aid in future planning. They were lively, serious, vocal, appreciative.

The views they expressed provide one index from one sample group. These views, together with views expressed orally by some of the speakers and with impressions of the monitor of the course, have been used in discussions with some of the staff members concerned. These discussions represent an effort to improve certain sections of the course which are important for the clandestine services but which did not go over as well as they should have. One of these was the CI Staff presentation. Another was the PP block. In the hands of PP concepts were delivered in a superior manner.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

(who was giving his swan song and has not been replaced) was above average and quite satisfactory. The four other PP presentations were less satisfactory. It is considering ways to improve 25X1A9a these. The FI presentations have been discussed with FI/Operations who will also give advice regarding the Tew weaker ones. He will name a substitute for one speaker who is leaving Headquarters; he is also considering the addition of a lecture on the FI approval system.

In short, the evaluations are being put to practical use with special attention to the presentations rated 2.9 and below, where the possibility for change appears to exist. It would appear inadvisable to attempt to deal with certain weak spots; e.g., (see the possibility of the 25X1A9a score of his "fatherly" approach and possibly also on the 25X1A9a subject of his "orderly".

25X1A9a

There is one other way in which the evaluations may be useful. This is as a slight service to at least one of the speakers; for instance, when was informed of the interest of the group in the records problem, he asked to be supplied with some of the unattributed comments to be used in supporting his belief that the branch and desk officers can be more seriously interested in the records problem. Such a memorandum has been drafted. (It suggests that the speakers themselves had a good deal to do with the interest in the problem.)

Pending discussions tentatively scheduled, a definite recommendation as to the length of the next course is impractical. The writer's own impression is that more time will be required for the next course.

25X1A9a

of the Assessment and Evaluation Staff was very helpful in providing critique forms and in tabulating the ratings. He agrees with the writer of this report that a simplified critique may be more practicable and equally useful.

#### 2. Students

Among the forty-six students who participated in CSR No. 18, the eight operating divisions were represented, as were the Office of Training, Security, and the Inspector General, and also the PP Staff and RI. One student was a GS-7 and one a GS-9; otherwise the grade span was from GS-11 through GS-15, with the overall average at GS-12.4. The age spread was from 27 to 53 years, 38.4 being the average age. Only two students were not returnees. One of these is scheduled for early duty overseas; one is a JOT. The returnees had been abroad for periods varying from 18 months to eight years. The students, with five exceptions, had had from six to nine years experience with CIA. (For statistical data, see Attachment No. 1)

### SEGRET

Approved For Release 2001/07/28: CIA-RDP78-04309A000100010022-1

#### 3. Lecturers

25X1A9a 25X1A9a Seventy different speakers came before the students in a total of fifty-nine topical presentations. Among these speakers, two appeared twice: a) for the PPC Staff and also as a substitute for for PP activities and again in the final seminar. Nine presentations included two or more participants: seven of these had two members only; one, four speakers; and three speakers held the final seminar. (Attachment No. 2 is a copy of the corrected schedule.)

#### a. Ratings of Presentations

In the ratings, provided in Attachment No. 3 are the composite answers to the first two questions of the critique; views as to:
1) the most outstanding and 2) the least adequate elements. The average rating is 3.0. These ratings, it is stressed, represent degrees of acceptability of various speakers to the students. The acceptability of the speakers and their adequacy as regards substantive content are not necessarily synonymous.

#### b. Reasons for High Ratings

Reasons adduced for support of outstanding ratings are:

- 1) honesty (or sincerity or interest) of the speaker (inversely, the lack of double-talk and self-justification).
  - 2) use of concrete illustration
  - 3) good organization of material
  - 4) good speaking ability

On this subject, the following specific comments are illustrative:

"The best speakers were those who devoted a minimum of time to organizational structure and were at the same time clearest on functions and processes whereby components carry out assigned tasks."

"The frank and honest views of the two senior officials, Mr. Kirkpatrick and Mr. Baird, make for stimulating thinking."

"Knowing that there are people on the highest levels of the organization thinking along the lines expressed by Mr. Kirkpatrick and Mr. Baird has a 're-motivation' effect of considerable magnitude."

25X1A9a

"A lucid, beautifully presented talk by a man who appears master of his subject and who can translate it into 'layman' terms."

"Outstanding lecture of the first week Good delivery. Very provocative."



25X1A9a

#### c. Reasons for Low Ratings

Reasons given for low ratings were generally the opposite of those given for high ratings:

insincerity, a patronizing manner, ("cloak of secrecy attitude")

vagueness, rambling or poorly organized presentation; lack of concreteness; "too broad generalizations"

too much detailed chart work

lack of understanding of, or ability to demonstrate, application of content to practical side

poor speaking ability

Illustrative samples include:

25X1A9a

"Speakers lectured us as though we were little boys who should be spanked. A regretable performance. Fifty minutes of this hour were wasted."

"Any interest in acting as a great white father should be restricted to occasions and persons who request such treatment."

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

"Suggest he hear Mr. Kirkpatrick's discussion of proper utilization of manpower." (Reference is to the man had turn charts for him) "An old Army game."

"Unfortunate monotonous delivery with inadequate interesting examples" (of the Elint talk)

"This lecture (CI Staff) was not well organized. A wandering lecture. Cut it in half, etc."

"Initial part (CI Staff) too general, repeated basic material already presented. Did not give enough specifics on the CI Staff itself; not enough examples showing how the staff actually work."

"Fi Staff's function here (Audio-surveillance) not clear - unless to serve as a block. Examples wanted."

#### 4. Value of the Course

The students were asked to evaluate the usefulness of the course as a whole as well as individual presentations. Their most significant response was to state emphatically and in what added up to a unanimous opinion that the course had been of value. This response, like reasons given to support it, is similar to that of previous classes. Almost everyone added a qualifying comment such as: "Of great value", "very" or "most valuable"; "Yes, indeed"; "definitely", and the like. Several stated that they considered it a <u>must</u> for all returnees; several also indicated that they wish they could have had the course prior to going overseas. At least two stated that it was "the finest" or "best" course attended in their Agency experience. Representative comments follow:

- a. "It offers an opportunity to see the larger picture and the time and opportunity to think about it."
- b. "It is the quickest means of getting in tune with Headquarters I can conceive of."
- c. "It has indicated the many support facilities and other services available to me as a case officer".
- d. "It is consoling to know that those who count know the things wrong with our organization even though they may not be able to help the situation".
- e. "This is the first time in five years I've been advised of many aspects of the material covered."
- f. "I have appreciated the opportunity to listen to key individuals who heretofore were names on an organizational chart. After hearing their problems, it is evident they are not the stumbling blocks they have been sometimes thought to be in the past."
- g. "Actually this course has had a stimulating effect. It has revived my enthusiasm for my work after a trying period abroad for two years. I only wish I had had this course six years ago."

Comment: Senior officials of the Agency and all those who make presentations before the CSR should be reminded of the appreciation evident in these remarks. This should be done when opportunity presents itself, but particularly when speakers are asked again and at the same time any suggestion is offered to them for changes in their presentations. Perhaps these comments should be mentioned in particular to the Training Officer for the DD/P and the staff training officers.

### SECRET

#### Approved For Release 2001/07/28: CIA-RDP78-04309A000100010022-1

#### 5. Length of Course

Of 46 students, only 24 responded to a request for opinion as to the length of the course. Of these: 1 - favored one week. (He is from the Office of Security rather than from the operating divisions), 19 - thought two weeks "adequate" "the right length" "just about perfect" or the like. Of those, however, one indicated the need of some juggling to increase time here, to delete time there; and two thought there should be some free afternoons, 1 - thought twelve or thirteen days "about right", 3 - thought three weeks better, two of these "indicating the need of some free afternoon".

The ten day schedule, as compared to previous twelve or fourteen day programs, involved no significant deletions and even a few additions. The changes required clipping of time here and there not met in all instances by a sufficient compression of material to permit a comfortable pace for the speaker or adequate time for questions. One important talk, on the National Indications Center, regularly scheduled for one hour as in this instance, appears to deserve more time. One or two talks (e.g., the talk on Relative Power Positions) can be deleted without harm to the objectives of the course. More time should probably be allowed for reading of regulations and materials provided. The steady, unbroken series of lectures should probably be relieved by some variant procedure. One useful variant in the schedule might be to provide an hour each for the CIA Support Exhibit and the Intelligence Products Exhibit on 4 and 5 December.

25X1A9a

Until the views of certain staff officials concerned, already requested (for instance, can be obtained, the balancing of all relevant factors herein discussed into a working schedule can hardly be accomplished. In this connection, paragraphs 6, 7, 8, and 9 provide helpful checklists.

Despite the numerous considerations for increased time, the course should probably not be extended any number of days longer than two weeks than seem necessary. In other words, if twelve or thirteen days are sufficient, the course should not be extended to three weeks by mere "filling".

6. Student Recommendations on Additional Topics to be Included

The most amusing comment under this section read: "Impossible to say, as many subjects have been included which I'd never heard of before". (Action taken or planned is indicated opposite each suggestion).

, , ,	c. S	uggest	ted Extensions of Tir	me for Lecture	es	
		1) NI	IC	1)	one hour	
25X1A7a		2) OF	RR	2)	one hour	
		3) F	I Requirements	3)	30 minutes to one hour	
		4) C	I	4)	add 30 minutes	
		5 <b>)</b>		5)	add 20 minutes	
		6) TS	SS	6)	add 20 minutes	
		7) 0	OMMO	7)	add 30 minutes	
·		8) 00	CB	8)	add 20 minutes	
		9) P	ersonnel	9)	to be discussed	
25X1A	1	10) R	IS	10)	add 30 minutes	X1A9a

#### 7. Student Recommendations on Unnecessary Presentations

11) CI/

(In response to a request to list any specific presentations regarded as unnecessary, the comments listed below were submitted. Opposite each is an indication of action taken or planned.

11) to be discussed with

	each is an indication of action taken t	or branned.
	Comment	Action Taken or Planned
	a. Eliminate: 1) Audit Staff - 12	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	2) Logistics (	25X1A9a 2) none
25X1A9a	3) World Power Positions	3) the omission of this is planned.
	b. Eliminate or shorten time of Recordeliminate - 1	who will
25X1A9a	shorten time - 2 talk - 2 talk - 1	advise. 25X1A9a
25X1A9a	(Note:	were both very well received)

#### -04309A0001000100<del>22</del>-1 Approved For Release 2001/97/28 : CIA

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

f. Area Divisions unnecessary - 1 reduce time - 1

g. Country Branch and Headquarters Case Officer unnecessary - 1 reduce time - 1

25X1A9a

- h. Audio-Surveillance in present form, unnecessary - 2
- i. Planning reduce time - 2 and combine overall and RMD

e. Continued

As for the PPC Staff CS Planning talk, welcomes advice very sincerely but finds it very hard to be less than stratospheric - to most listeners. (see i, below)

f. & g. suggestions re talks on host area division and denied area type of area division will be pursued.

25X1A

- h. of FI is considering and will advise.
- i. (See e above, second paragraph)
- 8. Suggestions for improving the administration of the course: Within a context complimentary to the Office of Training for its administration of this course, the following suggestions for improving the administration were made:
  - a. A little more time for reading
  - b. Longer breaks and or relief from compactness or to perform chores or half-day sessions, or at least part-time sessions.
  - c. RI tour and TSS tour. (Also, "No frills such as tours")
  - d. Urgent attention to air conditioning

- a. Plan to provide
- b. Plan to consider some variants in schedule such as brief reading periods after lunch or intelligence exhibits, but plan to keep on full-time basis, and keep within shortest period practicable.
- c. Neither an RI nor TSS tour appears practicable.
- d. Discussed this with Mr.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

"No excuse for such a poor public address system"

e. Discussed this with Mr. there is no better one available.

25X1A9a

- f. Expansion (and Shortening) of CE lecture.
- g. One hour discussions by each chief of operating division
- h. Coordination of staff talks to avoid repetition
- i. Advise speakers to use questions to stimulate audience
- j. "Inform the lecturers that it is not their function to defend themselves or their activity, but that their duty is to explain what their function is".
- k. Have debates on subjects such as staff vs. area operations, generalists vs. specialists
- 1. Use more visual aids
- m. Give a test
- n. Make sure the Coffee machine stays in good repair.

- who tells me
- f. Discussed with N
- g. Compartmentation rules out.
- "Coordinating" will be h. continued.
- i. Will so do in a few instances only.
- j. --! --
- k. No debates are planned
- 1. Probably not a representative suggestion.
- m. Probably not desirable.
- n. Important, Will keep my fingers crossed.

#### 9. Special Reminders or Suggestions

a. Mr. Baird, it is noted, has invited Mr. Patrick Coyne to speak next time on the NSC. This must be followed up. It is further noted that Mr. Baird indicated that he felt that Mr. Kirkpatrick should be invited to every CSR.

25X1A9a 25X1A9a

should be asked to give the talk on the NIE - or b. Mr. Kent or b. Mr. Kent or should be asked to give the talk on the NIE - or some member of their starr other than who is not a very good speaker: otherwise, the talk should perhaps be eliminated.

## 25X1Approved For Release 2001<del>/97</del>/28 : CIA-R**OF (\$10**4309A000100010022-1

25X1A9a 25X1A9a 25X1A9a 25X1A9a 25X1A9a

c. The talk on FI should, I believe, be asked to give. of interest.).

to come for a presentation.

is to let us know

25X1A9a 25X1A9a d. I Special Assistant to the DD/I, has been replaced by a This change might provide an opportunity to ask Mr. Amory

e. I should be encouraged to come, instead of

ead of

25X1A9a

f. A recommendation in the last report that a lecture on the Cable Secretariat be given should be followed, if the schedule permits.

g. talk was omitted, only because of his absence and should probably be included next time.

These listed suggestions do not preclude other ideas which may be brought to bear upon the actual programming of the next course.

25X1A9a

Approved For Release 2001/07/28 : CIA-RDP78-04309A000100010022-1